

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

x Pers of Gerhard GESELL
x Pers 2 Louis HECTOP 3589
x 45

has assumed all the authority he and the Attorney General have requested in the civil rights bill as far as the public accommodations section is concerned.

I submit that the statement in this report which the Secretary of Defense has ordered implemented that obedience to local laws on segregation should be stopped is nothing short of inciting to riot. It makes no difference how much the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, Mr. Yarmolinsky or Mr. Gesell may not agree with these laws, they are still laws and in full force.

In urging the military to breakdown local customs, the door is thrown wide open to use the military in the future to "instruct" the people in the "error of their ways" in not supporting some future President or some future political ideology.

Page 19 of the Gesell report says, and I quote:

Special effort should be made to recognize potential capacities of Negroes.

I read no statement in this report that special efforts should be made to recognize potential capacities of white men. This is a rank example of preferential treatment; not equal opportunity.

The fact that the promotion of officers responsible for achieving integration is, in the future, to be based in part on how successful he is in bringing about integration, makes it mandatory that he show favoritism and preferential treatment to all Negroes in order to achieve a good rating. I call your attention again to the statement of Secretary McNamara which he made on September 6, 1961, which I quoted earlier:

I believe we should prohibit military officers from participating in partisan politics, and we should prohibit partisan politics from affecting the promotion of an officer.

I suggest that the Secretary has a short memory or else one that conveniently releases him from any previous stands that prove inconvenient later.

Finally, I read on page 53 of the Gesell report this statement:

The base commander naturally looks upon his job as an opportunity to exercise military command; he conceives of his job as overwhelmingly military in character, his mission being to develop the units and troops under his command to peak efficiency.

You would imagine that, at this point, would follow the statement that, in following this concept, the base commander was absolutely correct.

However, the conclusion of the Gesell committee is that, in so doing, the base commander is a failure.

This is not just Barksdale Air Force Base and the surrounding communities in my district but yours as well. And if we can use the military today for social reform, who is to say that it will not be used at some future date by some misguided individual for political reform?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER) has expired.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER),

and also the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT).

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), and the other distinguished members from the State of Louisiana and wholeheartedly endorse their condemnation of the infamous Gesell report and all efforts to implement the same.

As the gentleman well knows, I have met with them and other concerned Congressmen to discuss the rash of illegal and unconstitutional executive directives which are presently being issued in defiance and contravention of the will of Congress. Of course, the Gesell report and its subsequent directive from the Secretary of Defense are the most reprehensible and contemptible of all such Executive orders.

As I join my colleagues in condemnation of these directives which not only threaten our military position, and the very constitutional basis of our Government, I likewise pledge to them my abiding support for any measures which they may recommend for the halting of such directives and returning the constitutionally granted power to the Congress.

THE GESELL REPORT: THE REAL FACTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I differ with the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the great Committee on Armed Services on which I have the privilege to serve, my good friend, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And it is not often that I differ with the distinguished chairman of one of our distinguished subcommittees, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT). We have over the years in our committee, I think, developed a somewhat nonpartisan and nonpolitical approach to matters of military concern which has made our committee somewhat unique in this body. But as a member of this committee and one who is deeply concerned with the morale and the efficiency of our armed services, and with the basic implementation of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, I feel that even at this late hour, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to set the record straight and to put forward here some of the real facts with regard to this document which has been the subject of such a one-sided discussion on this floor for the past 3 hours.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that having sat through the debates on yesterday when Members of this House were vying with one another in their concern over civil rights, it is a little hard to believe that this is the same body today, because Members, particularly those on the Re-

publican side of the aisle, were standing up to associate themselves with the position taken by our friends from the South. Those were the same Members who said yesterday that their interest in civil rights was so deep. Of course, others said that sudden interest was only a transient one. Apparently these latter were right, because the bloom seems suddenly to have faded from the civil rights rose—and in less than 24 hours at that.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to understand exactly what this Gesell report is, because there have been some rather strong statements made here about it in the past 3 hours.

We have been told that this is the beginning of SS troops in America. We have been told that this was the opening wedge for police state commissar programs in America. We have been told that we may have passed the point of no return in undermining the morale and efficiency of our armed services. We have been told that we are putting the military up to their necks in politics at every base in the United States. And we have been told that henceforth promotion is going to be based on color alone rather than competence.

I am not surprised that Members who have not had an opportunity to follow these matters or even to read the directive of the Secretary of Defense or to read the Gesell report itself should be concerned over these charges because if any of these charges were even remotely true this would indeed be a matter of greatest concern for anyone associated with the armed services.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is really no secret that we have been concerned for many years with eliminating discrimination and segregation in the armed services of the United States, and by Executive order, if not indeed by action of this Congress, distinguished Presidents in the past have felt that men and women in the services ought to be treated equally regardless of their race, their creed, or their color.

President Truman put forth an Executive order back in 1948, Executive Order 9881, calling for equality of treatment and opportunity in the Armed Forces. We did not collapse as a nation as a result of this order. The armed services did not degenerate. Grass did not grow in the streets, and SS troops did not march in the corridors.

Later on, in June of 1961, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, issued a memorandum on equality; but I do not recall that there were any viewings with alarm on this floor. We recognized then that the elimination of inequality meant that individual Army commanders should have a responsibility for trying to prevent discrimination in the facilities that were available around military bases as well as on the bases themselves.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I wish I could yield to my distinguished friend, but my friend and his associates had 3 hours. I have 1 brief hour to straighten out the record. We did not interrupt the gentleman's presentation.